Some New Results on Hunt's Hypothesis (H) for Lévy processes

Ze-Chun Hu
Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
e-mail: huzc@nju.edu.cn

Wei Sun
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University,
Montreal, H3G 1M8, Canada
e-mail: wsun@mathstat.concordia.ca

arXiv:1210.2016v1 [math.PR] 7 Oct 2012

Abstract In this paper, we consider Hunt's hypothesis (H) for Lévy processes. First, we give a comparison result on Lévy processes, which shows that big jumps do not influence (H) in some sense. Second, we extend the Kanda-Forst theorem and give a new class of Lévy processes satisfying (H). Third, we show that a special subordinator satisfies (H) if and only if its drift coefficient is 0, and that any locally quasi-stable subordinator satisfies (H).

Keywords Hunt's hypothesis, Lévy processes, subordinator.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) Primary: 60J45; Secondary: 60G51

1 Introduction

Let X be a nice Markov process. Hunt's hypothesis (H) says that "every semipolar set of X is polar". (H) plays a crucial role in the potential theory of (dual) Markov processes. To illustrate its importance, let us recall some potential principles.

Assume that $X = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, X_t, \theta_t, P^x)$ and $\hat{X} = (\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}_t, \hat{X}_t, \hat{\theta}_t, \hat{P}^x)$ are a pair of dual standard processes on $(E, \mathcal{E})$ with respect to a σ-finite reference measure ξ as described in [2, VI]. Denote by $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$ the resolvent operators for X.

- **Positivity principle** (P_α): If μ is a finite signed measure with $|\mu|U^\alpha|\mu| < \infty$, then $\mu U^\alpha \mu \geq 0$, where $|\mu|U^\alpha|\mu| = \int_E U^\alpha|\mu|(x)|\mu|(dx)$ is the α-energy of the measure $|\mu|$.
- **Bounded positivity principle** (P_α^*): If μ is a finite signed measure and $U^\alpha\mu$ is bounded, then $\mu U^\alpha \mu \geq 0$.
- **Energy principle** (E_α): If μ is a finite measure with compact support and $\mu U^\alpha \mu < \infty$, then μ does not charge semipolar sets.

- **Bounded energy principle** (E^*_α): If μ is a finite measure with compact support and $U^\alpha\mu$ is bounded, then μ does not charge semipolar sets.
- **Maximum principle** (M_α): If μ is a finite measure with compact support K, then $\sup\{U^\alpha\mu(x) : x \in E\} = \sup\{U^\alpha\mu(x) : x \in K\}$.
- **Bounded maximum principle** (M^*_α): If μ is a finite measure with compact support K and $U^\alpha\mu$ is bounded, then $\sup\{U^\alpha\mu(x) : x \in E\} = \sup\{U^\alpha\mu(x) : x \in K\}$.
- **Second maximum principle** (N_α): Let μ be a finite measure with compact support K and $\mu U^\alpha\mu < \infty$. If $U^\alpha\mu \leq U^\alpha\nu$ on K, then $U^\alpha\mu \leq U^\alpha\nu$ everywhere.
- **Polarity principle (Hunt's hypothesis (H))**: Each semipolar set is polar.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that all α-excessive functions are lower semicontinuous.*

(i) If $(E, \mathcal{E})$ is a locally compact space with countable base and, X and $\hat{X}$ are two Hunt processes, then $(P_\alpha) \Rightarrow (E_\alpha) \Rightarrow (N_\alpha)$.

(ii) For any $\alpha > 0$, $(M_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (E_\alpha)$. If $x \to U(x, K)$ is bounded for any compact set K, then $(M_0) \Leftrightarrow (E_0)$.

(iii) $(P^*_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (E^*_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (M^*_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (H)$.

Proof. (i) See [8]. (ii) See [3, Section 6].
(iii) $(M^*_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (H)$ is proved in [3]. $(P^*_\alpha) \Rightarrow (M^*_\alpha)$ is proved in [19]. $(M^*_\alpha) \Rightarrow (P^*_\alpha)$ is proved in [5]. By [3, Propsition (2.1)], $(E^*_\alpha) \Rightarrow (M^*_\alpha)$. It remains to show that $(M^*_\alpha) \Rightarrow (E^*_\alpha)$. Suppose (M^*_α) holds, then (H) holds, i.e., each semipolar set is polar. If μ is a finite measure with compact support and $U^\alpha\mu$ is bounded, then by [3, Proposition (5.1)], μ does not charge polar sets and thus μ does not charge semipolar sets, i.e., (E^*_α) holds. The proof is complete. □

In spite of its importance, (H) has been verified only in some special situations. By [2, VI.4.10] and Glover [9, Theorem (2.2)], (H) holds if and only if the fine and cofine topologies differ by polar sets. Some forty years ago, Getoor conjectured that essentially all Lévy processes satisfy (H).

From now on, we let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space and $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be an $\mathbf{R}^n$-valued Lévy process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ, i.e.,

$$E[\exp\{i\langle z, X_t\rangle\}] = \exp\{-t\psi(z)\},\ z \in \mathbf{R}^n, t \geq 0,$$

where E denotes the expectation with respect to P. For ψ, we have the following famous Lévy-Khintchine formula:

$$\psi(z) = i\langle a, z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z, Az\rangle + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle} + i\langle z, x\rangle 1_{\{|x|<1\}}\right) \mu(dx),$$

where $a \in \mathbf{R}^n$, A is a symmetric nonnegative definite $n \times n$ matrix, and μ is a measure (called the Lévy measure) on $\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\}$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\}}(1 \wedge |x|^2)\mu(dx) < \infty$. Hereafter, we use $\mathrm{Re}(\psi)$ and

$\mathrm{Im}(\psi)$ to denote the real part and imaginary part of ψ, respectively, and use (a, A, μ) to denote ψ some time. For $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, we denote by P^x the law of $x + X$ under P. In particular, $P^0 = P$.

Let $B \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. We define the first hitting time of B by

$$\sigma_B := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \in B\}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{B}^*$ the family of all nearly Borel sets relative to X (cf. [2, I.10.21]). A set $B \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is called polar (resp. essentially polar) if there exists a set $C \in \mathcal{B}^*$ such that $B \subset C$ and $P^x(\sigma_C < \infty) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ (resp. dx-almost every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$). Hereafter dx denotes the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$. B is called a thin set if there exists a set $C \in \mathcal{B}^*$ such that $B \subset C$ and $P^x(\sigma_C = 0) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. B is called semipolar if $B \subset \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ for some thin sets $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

We now recall some important results obtained so far for Getoor's conjecture. When $n = 1$, Kesten [17] (cf. also Bretagnolle [4]) showed that if X is not a compound Poisson process, then every $\{x\}$ is non-polar if and only if

$$\int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{Re}([1 + \psi(z)]^{-1}) dz < \infty.$$

Port and Stone [18] proved that for the asymmetric Cauchy process on the line every x is regular for $\{x\}$, and thus (H) holds in this case. Further, Blumenthal and Getoor [3] showed that all stable processes with index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ on the line satisfy (H).

Kanda [15] and Forst [7] proved that (H) holds if X has bounded continuous transition densities (with respect to dx) and the Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ satisfies $|\mathrm{Im}(\psi)| \leq M(1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi))$ for some positive constant M. Rao [19] gave a short proof of the Kanda-Forst theorem under the weaker condition that X has resolvent densities. In particular, for $n > 1$, all stable processes of index $\alpha \neq 1$ satisfy (H). Kanda [16] settled this problem for the case $\alpha = 1$ assuming the linear term vanishes. Silverstein [21] extended the Kanda-Forst condition to the non-symmetric Dirichlet forms setting, Fitzsimmons [6] extended it to the semi-Dirichlet forms setting and Han et al. [11] extended it to the positivity preserving forms setting. Glover and Rao [10] proved that α-subordinates of general Hunt processes satisfy (H). Rao [20] proved that if all 1-excessive functions of X are lower semicontinuous and $|\mathrm{Im}(\psi)| \leq (1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi))f(1 + \mathrm{Re}(\psi))$, where f is an increasing function on $[1, \infty)$ such that $\int_N^{\infty} (zf(z))^{-1} dz = \infty$ for any $N \geq 1$, then X satisfies (H).

Let X be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent (a, A, μ). In [14], we showed that if A is non-degenerate then X satisfies (H). Under the assumption that $\mu(\mathbf{R}^n \backslash \sqrt{A}\mathbf{R}^n) < \infty$, we showed that X satisfies (H) if and only if the equation

$$\sqrt{A}y = -a - \int_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \backslash \sqrt{A}\mathbf{R}^n :\, |x| < 1\}} x\mu(dx),\ y \in \mathbf{R}^n,$$

has at least one solution. We also showed that if X is a subordinator and satisfies (H) then its drift coefficient must be 0.

In this paper, we will continue to explore (H) for Lévy processes. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present a comparison result which shows that, for any Lévy process, big jumps do not influence (H) in some sense. In Section 3, we extend the Kanda-Forst theorem and give a new class of Lévy processes satisfying (H) as a corollary. In Section 4, we consider (H) for subordinators. We prove that a special subordinator satisfies (H) if and only if the drift coefficient is 0, and that any locally quasi-stable subordinator satisfies (H).

2 A comparison result on Lévy processes

Let X be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent (a, A, μ). Suppose that μ_1 is a finite measure on $\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\}$ such that $\mu_1 \leq \mu$. Define $\mu_2 := \mu - \mu_1$ and let X' be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent (a', A, μ_2), where

$$a' := a + \int_{\{|x|<1\}} x\mu_1(dx).$$

Theorem 2.1 *Let X and X' be two Lévy processes defined above. Then*
(i) they have the same semipolar sets;
(ii) they have the same essentially polar sets;
(iii) if both X and X' have resolvent densities, then X satisfies (H) if and only if X' satisfies (H).

Proof. Denote by ψ and ψ' the Lévy-Khintchine exponents of X and X', respectively. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi'(z) &= i\langle a', z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z, Az\rangle + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle} + i\langle z, x\rangle 1_{\{|x|<1\}}\right) \mu_2(dx), \\
\psi(z) &= i\langle a, z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z, Az\rangle + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle} + i\langle z, x\rangle 1_{\{|x|<1\}}\right) \mu(dx) \\
&= \psi'(z) + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle}\right) \mu_1(dx). \qquad (2.1)
\end{aligned}$$

(i) Suppose that Y is a compound Poisson process with Lévy measure μ_1 and independent of X'. Then, by (2.1), X has the same law as that of $X' + Y$. Let T_1 be the first jumping time of Y. Then T_1 possesses an exponential distribution and thus $P(T_1 > 0) = 1$. Hence, for any set A and any point $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, x is a regular point of A relative to X if and only if it is a regular point of A relative to X'. So X and X' have the same semipolar sets.

(ii) Set $C := \mu_1(\mathbf{R}^n\backslash\{0\})$. Then, by (2.1), we get

$$\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z) \leq \mathrm{Re}\psi(z) \leq \mathrm{Re}\psi'(z) + C, \qquad (2.2)$$

and

$$|\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)| \leq |\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z)| + C, \quad |\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z)| \leq |\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)| + C. \qquad (2.3)$$

For $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+\psi(z)}\right) &= \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi(z))^2}, && (2.4)\\ \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+\psi'(z)}\right) &= \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z))^2}. && (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

By (2.2) and (2.3), we find that if $\lambda \geq \sqrt{2}C$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi(z))^2} &\geq \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)+C)^2+(|\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z)|+C)^2}\\ &\geq \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)}{2[(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z))^2+2C^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z)^2]}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z)^2}. && (2.6)\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (2.6), we find that if $\lambda \geq 2C$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi'(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi'(z))^2} &\geq \frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)-C}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))^2+(|\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)|+C)^2}\\ &\geq \frac{\frac{1}{2}\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))^2+2C^2+2(\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)^2]}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{8}\frac{\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{(\lambda+\mathrm{Re}\psi(z))^2+(\mathrm{Im}\psi(z)^2}. && (2.7)\end{aligned}$$

By (2.4)-(2.7), we obtain that if $\lambda \geq 2C$, then for any $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$\frac{1}{4}\ \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+\psi'(z)}\right) \leq \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+\psi(z)}\right) \leq 8\ \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+\psi'(z)}\right). \tag{2.8}$$

By (2.8) and [13, Theorem 3.3], we obtain that any set which is essentially polar for X if and only if it is essentially polar for X'.

(iii) It is a direct consequence of (i), (ii) and [13, Theorem 2.1]. □

Corollary 2.2 *For $\delta > 0$, define $B_\delta = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : 0 < |x| < \delta\}$. Let X_δ be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent $(a_\delta, A, \mu|_{B_\delta})$, where*

$$a_\delta = \begin{cases} a + \int_{\delta\leq|x|<1} x\mu(dx), & \text{if } \delta < 1,\\ a, & \text{if } \delta \geq 1.\end{cases}$$

Then, all the assertions of Theorem 2.1 hold with X' replaced by X_δ.

Remark 2.3 *If $\int_{|x|\leq 1} |x|\mu(dx) < \infty$, then ψ can be expressed by*

$$\psi(z) = i\langle d, z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z, Az\rangle + \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \left(1 - e^{i\langle z,x\rangle}\right)\mu(dx), \tag{2.9}$$

where $-d$ is called the drift of X. In this case, we call (A,μ,d) the Lévy-Khintchine exponent of X. For $\delta>0$, define B_δ and X_δ as in Corollary 2.2. Let X'_δ be a Lévy process on $\mathbf{R}^n$ with Lévy-Khintchine exponent $(A,\mu|_{B_\delta},d)$. We claim that X_δ and X'_δ have the same law and then all the assertions of Theorem 2.1 hold with X' replaced by X'_δ. In fact, we have

$$d=a+\int_{\{|x|<1\}}x\mu(dx). \tag{2.10}$$

If $\delta<1$, then

$$a_\delta+\int_{\{|x|<1\}}x\mu|_{B_\delta}(dx)=\left(a+\int_{\{\delta\le|x|<1\}}\mu(dx)\right)+\int_{\{|x|<\delta\}}x\mu(dx)=d; \tag{2.11}$$

if $\delta\ge 1$, then

$$a_\delta+\int_{\{|x|<1\}}x\mu|_{B_\delta}(dx)=a+\int_{\{|x|<1\}}x\mu(dx)=d. \tag{2.12}$$

By (2.10)-(2.12), we know that X_δ and X'_δ have the same Lévy-Khintchine exponent $(A,\mu|_{B_\delta},d)$ and thus have the same law.

3 The extended Kanda-Forst theorem

Let f,g be two functions from $\mathbf{R}^n$ to $\mathbf{R}$. We write $f=O(g)$ if $\limsup_{|x|\to\infty}\frac{f(x)}{g(x)}<\infty$.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that X is a Lévy process with Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ and has resolvent densities. Then it satisfies (H) if the following Kanda-Forst-Rao condition holds:*

(KFR) There are two continuous functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 such that $\mathrm{Im}\psi=\psi_1+\psi_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\psi_1|\le M(1+Re\psi)\ \textit{for some positive constant } M,\ \textit{and}\\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\frac{|\psi_2(z)|}{(1+Re\psi(z))^2+(Im\psi(z))^2}dz<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.2 *(i) If $\psi_2=0$, then the (KFR) condition is just the Kanda-Forst sector condition; (ii) If $\psi_1=0$ and $|z|^\beta=O(|Im\psi(z)|)$ for some constant $\beta>1$, then the (KFR) condition holds.*

Proposition 3.3 *If $|z|^\beta=O(|\psi(z)|)$ for some constant $\beta>1$, then the (KFR) condition holds.*

Proof. Suppose that neither $|z|^\beta=O(Re\psi(z))$ nor $|z|^\beta=O(|Im\psi(z)|)$ holds, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{|z|^\beta}{Re\psi(z)}=\infty,\ \limsup_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{|z|^\beta}{|Im\psi(z)|}=\infty,$$

which implies that

$$\liminf_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{Re\psi(z)}{|z|^{\beta}}=0,\ \liminf_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{|Im\psi(z)|}{|z|^{\beta}}=0.$$

It follows that $\liminf_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{|\psi(z)|}{|z|^{\beta}}=0$, and thus $\limsup_{|z|\to\infty}\frac{|z|^{\beta}}{|\psi(z)|}=\infty$, which contradicts the assumption that $|z|^{\beta}=O(|\psi(z)|)$.

If $|z|^{\beta}=O(|Im\psi(z)|)$, then the (KFR) condition holds with $\psi_1=0$ by Remark 3.2(ii). Now suppose that $|z|^{\beta}=O(Re\psi(z))$. Take $\psi_1=0,\psi_2=Im\psi$. For any $z\in\mathbf{R}^n$, if $|Im\psi(z)|\leq 1+Re\psi(z)$, then

$$\frac{|\psi_2(z)|}{(1+Re\psi(z))^2+(Im\psi(z))^2}\leq\frac{|Im\psi(z)|}{(1+Re\psi(z))^2}\leq\frac{1}{1+Re\psi(z)};\tag{3.1}$$

if $|Im\psi(z)|>1+Re\psi(z)$, then

$$\frac{|\psi_2(z)|}{(1+Re\psi(z))^2+(Im\psi(z))^2}\leq\frac{|Im\psi_2(z)|}{(Im\psi(z))^2}<\frac{1}{1+Re\psi(z)}.\tag{3.2}$$

By (3.1), (3.2) and $|z|^{\beta}=O(Re\psi(z))(\beta>1)$, we know that the (KFR) condition holds in this case. □

In [1], the following index has been introduced:

$$\beta''=\sup\{\alpha\geq 0:|y|^{-\alpha}Re\psi(y)\to\infty\text{ as }|y|\to\infty\}.$$

Corollary 3.4 *Let X be a Lévy process with Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ such that its $\beta''>1$. Then, X satisfies (H).*

Proof. By [12] and $\beta''>1$, we know that X has bounded continuous densities. Then, by Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.3, we obtain that X satisfies (H). □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show that (P^*_{α}) holds for some $\alpha>0$. We take $\alpha=1$. The idea of the proof comes from [19, Proposition 1]. Let m be a finite signed measure, U^1m be bounded and

$$E_m(z)=\int u(y-x-z)m(dx)m(dy).$$

Then $E_m(0)$ is the 1-energy of m. We will prove that $E_m(0)\geq 0$, i.e., (P^*_1) holds. By the proof of [19, Proposition 1], we know that $|\hat{m}|^2Re(1+\psi)^{-1}\in L^1(\mathbf{R}^n),\hat{E}_m(\alpha)=|\hat{m}|^2(1+\psi(-\alpha))^{-1}$. It is enough to show that $\hat{E}_m(\alpha)\in L^1(\mathbf{R}^n)$, where $\hat{m}$ is the Fourier transform of m, i.e., $\hat{m}(\alpha)=\int e^{i(\alpha,t)}m(dt)$. By $|\hat{m}|^2Re(1+\psi)^{-1}\in L^1(\mathbf{R}^n)$ and the (KFR) condition, noticing that $\hat{m}$ is a bounded function, we obtain

$$\int|\hat{m}(\alpha)|^2|(1+\psi(-\alpha))^{-1}|d\alpha$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int |\hat{m}(\alpha)|^2 \left| \frac{1}{1+Re\psi(\alpha) - iIm\psi(\alpha)} \right| d\alpha \\
&= \int |\hat{m}(\alpha)|^2 \left| \frac{1+Re\psi(\alpha) + iIm\psi(\alpha)}{(1+Re\psi(\alpha))^2 + (Im\psi(\alpha))^2} \right| d\alpha \\
&\leq \int |\hat{m}(\alpha)|^2 \frac{1+Re\psi(\alpha) + |\psi_1(\alpha)| + |\psi_2(\alpha)|}{(1+Re\psi(\alpha))^2 + (Im\psi(\alpha))^2} d\alpha \\
&\leq \int |\hat{m}(\alpha)|^2 \left((1+M)Re(1+\psi(\alpha))^{-1} + \frac{|\psi_2(\alpha)|}{(1+Re\psi(\alpha))^2 + (Im\psi(\alpha))^2} \right) d\alpha < \infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

4 (H) for subordinators

In this section, we consider (H) for subordinators. Suppose that X is a subordinator. Then its Lévy-Khintchine exponent ψ can be expressed by

$$\psi(z) = -idz + \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(1 - e^{izx}\right)\mu(dx), \ z \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $d \geq 0$ (called the drift coefficient) and μ satisfies $\int_{(0,\infty)}(1 \wedge x)\mu(dx) < \infty$. In [14], we have proved the following result.

Proposition 4.1 *If X is a subordinator and satisfies (H), then $d = 0$.*

Conversely, if $d = 0$ and μ is a finite measure, then X is a compound Poisson process and thus satisfies (H). Hence we need only consider the case that $d = 0$ and μ is an infinite measure.

The potential measure U of X is defined by

$$U(A) = E\left[\int_0^\infty 1_{\{X_t \in A\}} dt\right], \ A \subset [0,\infty).$$

For $\alpha > 0$, the α-potential measure U^α of X is defined by

$$U^\alpha(A) = E\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} 1_{\{X_t \in A\}} dt\right], \ A \subset [0,\infty).$$

4.1 Special subordinators

X is called a *special subordinator* if $U|_{(0,\infty)}$ has a decreasing density with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 4.2 *Suppose that X is a special subordinator. Then X satisfies (H) if and only if $d = 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, we need only prove the sufficiency. Suppose that $d = 0$. If μ is a finite measure, then X is a compound Poisson process and thus satisfies (H).

Now we consider the case that μ is an infinite measure. By [4, Theorem 8], X does not hit points, i.e., any single point set $\{x\}$ is a polar set of X, which together with the assumption that $U|_{(0,\infty)}$ has a decreasing density with respect to the Lebesgure measure, implies that $U|_{[0,\infty)}$ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Since for any $\alpha > 0$, $U^\alpha(\cdot) \leq U(\cdot)$, we get that for any $\alpha \geq 0$, U^α is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then by [13, theorem 2.1], we know that for any $\alpha \geq 0$, all α-excessive functions are lower semicontinuous. Therefore, by the fact that X does not hit points, [3, Proposition (5.1), Theorem (5.3)], following the proof for stable subordinators [3, page 140], we find that X satisfies (H). □

4.2 Locally (quasi-)stable subordinators

Let S be a stable subordinator of index $\alpha, 0 < \alpha < 1$. Then, its Lévy-Khintchine exponent Ψ_S has the form

$$\Psi_S(z) = c|z|^\alpha(1 - i\,\mathrm{sgn}(z)\tan(\pi\alpha/2)),\ z \in (-\infty, \infty), \tag{4.2}$$

where $c > 0$. Its Lévy measure μ_S is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure dx and can be expressed by

$$\mu_S(dx) = \begin{cases} c^+ x^{-\alpha-1}dx, & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $c^+ > 0$.

Definition 4.3 *Let X be a subordinator with drift 0 and Lévy measure μ. If there exists a stable subordinator S with Lévy measure μ_S and a positive constant δ such that $\mu = \mu_S + \mu'$ on $(0, \delta)$, where μ' is a finite measure on $(0, \delta)$, then we call X a* **locally quasi-stable subordinator***. If $\mu' = 0$, we call X a* **locally stable subordinator***.*

Proposition 4.4 *Let X be a locally quasi-stable subordinator. Then it satisfies (H).*

Proof. Let X and S be as in Definition 4.3. It is well known that S satisfies (H). By Theorem 2.1 (see Remark 2.3), we know that X and S have the same semipolar sets and the same essentially polar sets. Then it suffices to show that they have resolvent densities by Theorem 2.1(iii). In fact, we will prove in the following that they have bounded continuous transition densities.

Denote by ψ and ψ_S the Lévy-Khintchine exponents of X and S, respectively. Denote $C_\delta = \mu_S([\delta, \infty))$. Then $0 < C_\delta < \infty$. By (4.1), (4.2) and Definition 4.3, we get

$$\mathrm{Re}\psi(z) = \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - \cos(zx))\mu(dx)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\geq \int_{(0,\delta)} (1-\cos(zx))\mu(dx) \\
&\geq \int_{(0,\delta)} (1-\cos(zx))\mu_S(dx) \\
&= \int_{(0,\infty)} (1-\cos(zx))\mu_S(dx) - \int_{[\delta,\infty)} (1-\cos(zx))\mu_S(dx) \\
&= \mathrm{Re}\psi_S(z) - \int_{[\delta,\infty)} (1-\cos(zx))\mu_S(dx) \\
&\geq c|z|^\alpha - \mu_S([\delta,\infty)),
\end{aligned}
$$

which together with (4.2) implies that

$$\lim_{|z|\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}\psi(z)}{\ln(1+|z|)} = \lim_{|z|\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}\psi_S(z)}{\ln(1+|z|)} = \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

By [12] and (4.3), we find that X and S have bounded continuous transition densities. □

Corollary 4.5 *Suppose that φ is a Lévy-Khinchine exponent. Then the Lévy process with exponent*

$$\Phi(z) := \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(1 - e^{-\varphi(z)x}\right) \mu(dx) \tag{4.4}$$

satisfies (H), if one of the following two conditions holds.

(i) μ is a Lévy measure of some special subordinator with drift 0;

(ii) $\mu = \mu_S|_{(0,\delta)} + \mu'$, where μ_S is s Lévy measure of some stable subordinator, δ is a positive constant and μ' is a finite measure on $(0,\infty)$.

Proof. Let X be the Lévy process corresponding to φ, and T_t be a subordinator independent of X with drift 0 and Lévy measure μ. Then $Y := X(T_t)$ has the Lévy exponent Φ defined by (4.4). Therefore, by [10, Theorem 1], Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 4.4, we obtain that Y satisfies (H). □

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the support of NNSFC, Jiangsu Province basic research program (Natural Science Foundation)(Grant No. BK2012720), A Project Funded by the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD) and NSERC.

References

[1] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K.: Sample functions of stochastic processes with stationary independent increments. Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics, **10**, 493-516 (1961).

[2] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K.: Markov Processes and Potential Theory. Academic Press, New York and London (1968).

[3] Blumenthal R.M., Getoor R.K.: Dual processes and potential theory. Proc. 12th Biennial Seminar of the Canadian Math. Congress, 137-156 (1970).

[4] Bretagnolle J.: Résults de Kesten sur les processus à accroissements indépendants. Séminare de Probabilités V, Lect. Notes in Math., Vol. 191, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 21-36 (1971).

[5] Fitzsimmons P.J.: On the equivalence of three potential principles for right Markov processes, Probab. Th. Rel. Fields, **84**, 251-265 (1990).

[6] Fitzsimmons P.J.: On the quasi-regularity of semi-Dirichlet forms. Potential Anal. **15**, 151-185 (2001).

[7] Forst G.: The definition of energy in non-symmetric translation invariant Dirichlet spaces. Math. Ann. **216**, 165-172 (1975).

[8] Glover J.: Energy and the maximum principle for nonsymmetric Hunt processes, Probability Theory and its Applications, XXVI, 4, 757-768 (1981).

[9] Glover J.: Topics in energy and potential theory. Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1982, Birkhäuser, 195-202 (1983).

[10] Glover J., Rao M.: Hunt's hypothesis (H) and Getoor's conjecture. Ann. Probab. **14**, 1085-1087 (1986).

[11] Han X.-F., Ma Z.-M. and Sun W.: $h\hat{h}$-transforms of positivity preserving semigroups and associated Makov processes, Acta Math. Sinica, English Series, **27**, 369-376 (2011).

[12] Hartman P., Wintner A.: On the infinitesimal generators of integral convolutions. Amer. J. Math. **64**, 273-298 (1942).

[13] Hawkes J.: Potential theory of Lévy processes. Proc. London Math. Soc. **3**, 335-352 (1979).

[14] Hu Z.-C. and Sun W.: Hunt's hypothesis (H) and Getoor's conjecture for Lévy processes, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications, **122**, 2319-2328 (2012).

[15] Kanda M.: Two theorems on capacity for Markov processes with stationary independent increments. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **35**, 159-165 (1976).

[16] Kanda M.: Characterisation of semipolar sets for processes with stationary independent increments. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **42**, 141-154 (1978).

[17] Kesten H.: Hitting probabilities of single points for processes with stationary independent increments. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 93 American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. (1969).

[18] Port S.C., Stone C.J.: The asymmetric Cauchy process on the line. Ann. Math. Statist. **40**, 137-143 (1969).

[19] Rao M.: On a result of M. Kanda. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **41**, 35-37 (1977).

[20] Rao M.: Hunt's hypothesis for Lévy processes. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104**, 621-624 (1988).

[21] Silverstein M.L.: The sector condition implies that semipolar sets are quasi-polar. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **41**, 13-33 (1977).